



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

Defender of Cameron Dam—Guilty.—John Dietz, the defender of Cameron Dam, who for nearly a decade has been before the eyes of the public because of his setting at defiance officers of the law sent to him to serve process, has been tried and convicted, and his conviction affirmed in *Dietz v. State*, 136 Northwestern Reporter, 166. The facts are briefly as follows: In September, 1910, a criminal warrant was placed in the hands of the sheriff commanding him to arrest Dietz on a charge of assault with intent to murder. The sheriff, who also had other warrants for his arrest on charges for which he had never been apprehended, formed a posse, which approached the Dietz farm and surrounded it, being "armed to the teeth." On his refusal to surrender, they opened siege with their rifles, and many shots were fired at and from the Dietz homestead, wherein was not only Dietz, but a woman and children. During this miniature battle one of the deputies was struck and killed. Later Dietz surrendered and was arrested, charged with the murder of the deputy killed in the affray. The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and he was sentenced to life imprisonment. On appeal the Supreme Court of Wisconsin affirms the conviction, holding that the evidence sustains the verdict. One of the interesting points raised on appeal which grew out of the fact that, on his declining to be defended by counsel, Dietz was allowed to conduct his own defense, was the contention that the court should have appointed an attorney to defend the case, or at least to act as *amicus curiæ*, and see that his rights were fully preserved, for he was unlettered and had no knowledge of the law. From the beginning to the end of the case it appears that Dietz made objections to the admissibility of evidence offered, which in some instances, the court says, could hardly have been improved by an accomplished lawyer. The court says he was very active, and managed the case with a shrewdness and knowledge which was not only surprising, but which may well have been fully as effective as if the defense had been conducted by an attorney, and therefore together with the reason that the Constitution guarantees one the right to be heard "by himself" as well as counsel, holds the contention without merit. In closing, the court says: "After a patient and fair trial, the defendant has been found guilty of a death upon ample evidence. Pity the defendant as we may, we have no choice of course on this record. It is as true now as it was in the days of the Hebrew prophet, that he who sows the wind must needs be content if he be compelled to reap the inevitable whirlwind."

Attorneys.—Constitutional provisions entitling a person accused of crime to appear by counsel, and forbidding the taking of prop-